



5c
#8
PATENT 2-3-03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Iremonger et al.

Attorney Docket No.: CLARP026/P2425

Application No.: 09/378,526

Examiner: Romero, A.

Filed: August 20, 1999

Group: 2176

Title: ASSISTANT FOR CREATION OF
LAYOUTS OR REPORTS FOR DATABASES

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with
the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail to:
Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on January
24, 2003.

Signed: 

Kristina Gomez

RESPONSE A

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated October 24, 2002, please enter the following remarks.

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending. In the Office Action, the Examiner has stated that some of the references cited by the Applicant in an Information Disclosure Statement dated August 20, 1999, were not considered (paper #5). It is respectfully submitted that another Information Disclosure Statement (dated November 6, 2002) has been submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 1.56 and 1.97(c). It is believed that this Information Disclosure Statement complies with MPEP §609. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider all references. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). This rejection is fully traversed below.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,832,481 (*Sheffield*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,704,029 (*Wright*). The invention relates to an assistant for the creation of layouts/reports for databases. A

RECEIVED
JAN 3 1 2003
Technology Center 2100

layout for a database is the arrangement of information for the database, such as for data entry or screen viewing, and a report (or report format) for a database is the arrangement of information from the database for presentation of the data in a printed document or for on-line viewing. The assistant serves to automate the creation of the layout/reports after an interview sequence with a user.

As such, claim 1 recites a method for creating a report or layout for data stored in a database. This method includes the acts of (a) performing an interview sequence to obtain organization information, the organization information including at least a list of fields and at least one summary field for the report or layout, the at least one summary field being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields; and (b) automatically creating the report or layout based on the interview sequence.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that *Sheffield* does not teach performing an interview sequence to obtain organization information, the organization information including at least a list of fields and at least one summary field for the report or layout. (Office Action, page 9). Clearly, based on the Examiner's admission, *Sheffield* cannot teach performing an interview sequence to obtain organization information such that at least one summary field is being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields. In other words, the Examiner has effectively admitted that *Sheffield* does not teach the feature of (a) performing an interview sequence to obtain organization information, the organization information including at least a list of fields and at least one summary field for the report or layout, the at least one summary field being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields. This should be clear since, by the Examiner's own admission, *Sheffield* does not teach performing an interview sequence to obtain organization information at all. Nevertheless, the Examiner seems to be asserting that *Sheffield* teaches at least one summary field being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields. (Office Action, page 9). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is improper because it does not address the recited feature in the context of the invention (i.e., at least one summary field being associated with one of the fields in the list of fields in the context of performing an interview sequence). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Moreover, it is earnestly believed that *Sheffield* does not teach or suggest automatically creating a report layout for data stored in a database based on the

interview sequence performed in the context of the invention. *Sheffield* pertains to an interface between a computer database manager and a client application. The interface object is programmed to allow an application programmer using the interface object to tailor the column/style associations to the database without access to the source code. (*Sheffield*, Abstract). It is noted, as suggested by the Examiner, that *Sheffield* may teach populating fields from a script into an area. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, this does not teach or suggest automatically creating a report layout for data stored in a database based on the interview sequence. In fact, it is earnestly believed that *Sheffield* does not even address generating a report layout for a database.

Furthermore, it is earnestly believed that *Wright* also fails to teach or suggest automatically creating a report layout for data stored in a database based on the interview sequence performed in the context of the invention. *Wright* pertains to a system and method for providing computerized forms completion and processing. It is noted that *Wright* describes a form engine which presents a single item or question to the user (*Wright*, Col. 3, lines 40-55). However, this does not teach or suggest automatically creating a report layout for data stored in a database based on the interview sequence performed in the context of the invention. In fact, *Wright* does not even teach implementation of a database program. As such, *Wright* cannot possibly teach automatically creating a report layout for data stored in a database based on the interview sequence performed in the context of the invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over *Sheffield* and *Wright* taken alone or in any proper combination. Independent claims 17 and 31 recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 17 and 31 claims and their dependent claims are also patentable over *Sheffield* and *Wright* for similar reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Summary

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-38 are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the rejections.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. CLARP026).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300